REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 27 and 36 are amended. Claims 1-48 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Telephonic Interview:

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended in the telephonic interview of January 19, 2011. The amendments included above reflect the agreement reached in that interview. Specifically, the Examiner has indicated that the amendments overcome the cited art as described below, by clarifying that a single message gate performs both the receiving and sending functions with respect to an event message sent from a service over a network and a markup language representation of the event message, respectively.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chu-Carroll et al. (U.S. Publication 2006/0200488) (hereinafter "Chu-Carroll"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, inasmuch as it may be applied to the amended claims, for at least the following reasons.

1. **Chu-Carroll does not disclose an event message gate configured to perform both the receiving and sending limitations of claim 14 with respect to the same event, as recited.**

Applicants have amended claim 14 to clarify that the recited event message gate unit is configured to "automatically subscribe to the one or more events with the service in response to said indications registering interest in the one or more events received from the one or more client processes such that the event message gate unit becomes subscribed to the one or more events." Further, Applicants have amended claim 14 to clarify that the recited event message gate unit is configured to "receive over a network a

message in a markup language, wherein the message is received at the event message gate unit from the service in the distributed computing environment," and "send the markup language representation of the event from the event message gate unit to at least one of the one or more client processes." Chu-Carroll does not disclose a single entity, such as the recited event message gate unit, capable of performing both of the recited receiving and sending functions. The Final Office Action had previously cited ¶¶[0079]-[0083] of Chu-Carroll as performing some sending and receiving functions. However, as agreed in the interview of January 19, 2011, Chu-Carroll provides no such single gate unit equipped for both the recited sending and receiving functions as amended above.

Those sections of Chu-Carroll describing that "the event system executing on the client side receives the registrations from the server" do not disclose the recited "receive over a network a message in a markup language, wherein the message is received at the event message gate unit from the service in the distributed computing environment," for a single event associated with the recited "send the markup language representation of the event from the event message gate unit to at least one of the one or more client processes." The above amendment clarifies the identity of the entity associated with both the receiving and the sending features of the recited claim, as well as clarifying receipt over a network.

Applicants submit that receiving a registration at a server in ¶¶[0079]-[0083] of Chu-Carroll does not disclose, either explicitly or under the principles of inherency, the recited "receive over a network a message in a markup language, wherein the message is received at the event message gate unit from the service in the distributed computing environment," because the registration received from does not include "a markup language representation of one of the one or more events generated by the service," as recited. Applicants further submit that the amendment further clarifies that such a registration message does not satisfy the recited limitations.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 14, inasmuch as it might be argued against amended claim 14, is not supported by the cited art and

withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 1, 27, and 36, which are rejected under reasoning similar to that discussed against claim 14. Likewise, each of dependent claims 2-13, 15-26, 38-35 and 37-48 depends from and further patentably distinguishes a respective one of allowable base claims 1, 14, 27 and 36. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-48 and a notice of allowance with respect to each of claims 1-48.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-65700/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 28, 2011